

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTH CAROLINA DISTRICT

-----x
Christopher J. France, :
Plaintiff :
-against- :
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON, :
ALICE A. RICHTER, THOMAS T. HODGES, :
and JULIE J. ARMSTRONG, as paid jurists and/or :
employees for the COUNTY OF CHARLESTON :
COURTS and individually, and :
EMILY G. JOHNSTON, VICTORIA K. RHEA, :
And SARA VON SCHWEINITZ as employees :
of the Emily G. Johnston Law Firm and :
Individually, MICHAEL H. LEACH as employee :
of South Carolina Department of Social Services :
and individually, LISA A. FRANCE, individually :
Defendants. :
-----x

2:23-cv-00157-BHH-MHC

2023 JAN 12 AMJL:09
CLERK, CHARLESTON, SC
RECEIVED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

COMPLAINT

Christopher J. France
Sui Juris
c/o 115 Tomshire Drive, #101
Johns Island, South Carolina [29455]
(704) 661-6564 (Phone)
chris@christopherfrance.com (email)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<i>NATURE OF ACTION</i>	3
Case Summary	3
<i>JURISDICTION, VENUE, and CONDITIONS PRECEDENT</i>	4
<i>THE PARTIES</i>	5
<i>ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION</i>	7
Emily G. Johnston Misconduct.....	7
The COUNTY OF CHARLESTON Misconduct	7
Alice A. Richter Misconduct	7
Julie J. Armstrong Misconduct	7
Victoria K. Rhea Misconduct	8
Sara Von Schweinitz Misconduct.....	8
Lissa A. France Misconduct.....	8
Michael H. Leach Misconduct.....	8
Thomas T. Hodges Misconduct	9
Plaintiff's Damages and Injuries.....	9
<i>FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Malicious Prosecution Under State Law; All Defendants)</i>	10
<i>SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress Under State Law; All Defendants)</i>	11
<i>THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION (Abuse of Process Under State Law; Defendants ARMSTRONG, RICHTER, HODGES, JOHNSTON, RHEA, VON SCHWEINITZ, LEACH, COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)</i>	12
<i>FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Actual and Constructive Fraud Under State Law; Defendants ARMSTRONG, RICHTER, HODGES, JOHNSTON, RHEA, VON SCHWEINITZ, LEACH, COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)</i>	13
<i>FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION (42 U.S.C. § 1983; Denial of Due Process and A Fair Trial Under the Fifth, Sixth, Seventh Amendments; All Defendants)</i>	14
<i>SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION (42 U.S.C. § 1983; Denial of Religious Freedom and Right to Assemble under the First Amendment; All Defendants)</i>	15
<i>SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION (42 U.S.C. § 1983; Denial of Privacy and Seizure of my rights which are my property protected under the Fourth Amendment; All Defendants)</i>	17
<i>EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION (42 U.S.C. § 1983; Denial of Right to Freely Travel under the Ninth Amendment; All Defendants)</i>	18

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION (42 U.S.C. § 1983; Denial of Freedom by imposing Slavery/Indentured Servitude under the Thirteenth Amendment; All Defendants).....	19
TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION (42 U.S.C. § 1983; Impairing my Ability to Contract under Article I, Section 10, Clause 1; All Defendants).....	20
EMPANEL GRAND JURY.....	22
IMMUNITY.....	22
NOTICE OF HEARSAY.....	22
DAMAGES DEMAND.....	23
EXHIBIT ONE – AFFIDAVIT OF STATUS.....	24
EXHIBIT TWO – AFFIDAVIT OF FACT.....	25
EXHIBIT THREE – NOTICE OF CLAIM	26
EXHIBIT FOUR – Attestation of Facts in the Form of an Affidavit – Distribution of Marital Assets.....	27

NATURE OF ACTION

I, Christopher J. France, hereinafter I, me, my, myself, reserve all my God-given rights, secured, and protected by the Constitution of the United States of America. I waive no rights, EVER and I am making a special appearance in this court.

Case Summary:

- 1) This is a Constitutional Court of Record in exclusive common law under Article III, sec. 2 clause 1 of the original jurisdiction and Amendment 7, Suits at Common Law. This is the only court authorized to hear matters of the People
- 2) An action under State Color of Law was brought against me from an Article 1 Administrative, Municipal, Family Court to deal with a matter that was between a man (Christopher J. France) and a woman (Lisa A. France)
- 3) I informed them repeatedly through many affidavits and hearings that they did not have jurisdiction, standing, or authority to adjudicate this matter. I did NOT CONSENT for that action to be handled in an Article 1 Administrative Court. They ignored me and proceeded to deprive me many of my God-given rights that are protected by the United States Constitution (Amendments 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 13)

- 4) Employees of the State of South Carolina, County of Charleston, and Emily G. Johnson Law firm conspired to write a temporary administrative order under the color of law to seize 75% of my current and future earnings. The garnishing of wages is in effect based on false allegations, no evidence, and no trial by jury; thus, depriving me of my due process which includes trial by jury.
- 5) I sent these defendants a Notice of Claim, see EXHIBIT THREE, seeking damages and filed it into the record of their STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, COUNTY OF CHARLESTON, Administrative Family Court, case number 21-DR-10-3274; they are a business/corporation masquerading as a Lawful Government
- 6) None of my affidavits have been rebutted by any of the Defendants and stand as fact in law. Silence is acquiescence and they stand as fact according to US Supreme Court Case law on unrebutted affidavits.
- 7) That Notice of Claim listed in EXHIBIT THREE is the genesis of this action.
- 8) I suffered tremendous financial, mental, emotional, spiritual, sleep deprivation, and health harm due to these trespasses
- 9) I am seeking damages under 42 USC § 1983 in this court for the following:
 - a. Damages: \$20,000,000 (Twenty Million USD)
 - b. Punitive damages: \$60,000,000 (Forty Million USD), 18 U.S. Code § 2333 - Civil remedies
 - c. Stop the unlawful garnishing of my earnings
 - d. Dismiss case 21-DR-10-3274 with extreme prejudice

JURISDICTION, VENUE, and CONDITIONS PRECEDENT

- 10) This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction, pursuant to 28 USC § 1331, because the matter in controversy arises under the Constitution and laws of the United States, including, but not limited to, the First, Fourth, and Fifth, and Seventh Amendments to the United States Constitution and by principals of pendent jurisdiction
- 11) This case is also brought under 42 USC § 1983, which provides for redress of the deprivation, under color of state law, of rights, privileges, and immunities secured to Plaintiff by the United States Constitution, particularly the First, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Ninth, and Thirteenth Amendments. Thus, this Court also has subject-matter

jurisdiction under 28 USC § 1343(a)(3), (4), and by principals of pendent jurisdiction

12) This is the only court authorized to hear matters of the People—A Constitutional Court
of Record in exclusive common law under Article III, sec. 2 clause 1 of the original
jurisdiction and Amendment 7, Suits at Common Law.

13) Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 USC § 1391

14) On or about September 3, 2022, Plaintiff served upon Defendants timely notice of the
present claims and a hearing was held November 29, 2022. Thomas T. Hodges denied
my motion to dismiss and set a trial date. And he ordered the garnishing to continue
even before a trial (guilty until proven innocent) so I added him to the claim.

15) This action has been commenced within one year of the accrual of Plaintiff's causes of
action.

16) Plaintiff has duly complied with all the conditions precedent to the commencement of
this action

THE PARTIES

17) Plaintiff, Christopher J. France, is an Ohioan, one of the People of this United States of
America, and currently domiciled in South Carolina

- a. See EXHIBIT ONE – AFFIDAVIT OF STATUS
- b. See EXHIBIT TWO – AFFIDAVIT OF FACT
- c. See EXHIBIT THREE – NOTICE OF CLAIM

18) Defendant, COUNTY OF CHARLESTON, is a municipal corporation of the State of
South Carolina and is a resident in the District of South Carolina

19) Defendant, ALICE A. RICHTER, at all relevant times was an Administrator, was
employed by the State of South Carolina and working with the COUNTY OF
CHARLESTON, acted toward Plaintiff under color of statutes, ordinances, customs,
rules, and usage of the State of South Carolina, and acted within the scope of her
employment. She is sued in her individual and her official capacities.

20) Defendant, EMILY G. JOHNSTON, at all relevant times was an attorney, was
employed by the Emily G. Johnston Law Firm, acted toward Plaintiff under color of
statutes, ordinances, customs, rules, and usage of the State of South Carolina, and acted
within the scope of her employment. She is sued in her individual and her official

capacities.

- 21) Defendant, VICTORIA K. RHEA, at all relevant times was an attorney, was employed by the Emily G. Johnston Law Firm, acted toward Plaintiff under color of statutes, ordinances, customs, rules, and usage of the State of South Carolina, and acted within the scope of her employment. She is sued in her individual and her official capacities
- 22) Defendant, SARA VON SCHWEINITZ, at all relevant times was a paralegal, was employed by the Emily G. Johnston Law Firm, acted toward Plaintiff under color of statutes, ordinances, customs, rules, and usage of the State of South Carolina, and acted within the scope of her employment. She is sued in her individual and her official capacities
- 23) Defendant, JULIE J. ARMSTRONG, at all relevant times was the Clerk of Court, was employed by the COUNTY OF CHARLESTON, acted toward Plaintiff under color of statutes, ordinances, customs, rules, and usage of the State of South Carolina, and acted within the scope of her employment. She is sued in her individual and her official capacities
- 24) Defendant, LISA A. FRANCE, at all relevant times was the accuser and initiator of action in Family Court Case 21-DR-10-3274, acted toward Plaintiff under color of statutes, ordinances, customs, rules, and usage of the State of South Carolina Codes and Statutes. She is sued in her individual capacity.
- 25) Defendant, MICHAEL H. LEACH, at all relevant times was the South Carolina Director of the Department of Social Services, was employed by the State of South Carolina and working with the COUNTY OF CHARLESTON, acted toward Plaintiff under color of statutes, ordinances, customs, rules, and usage of the State of South Carolina, and acted within the scope of his employment. He is sued in his individual and his official capacities.
- 26) Defendant, THOMAS T. HODGES, at all relevant times was an Administrator, was employed by the State of South Carolina and working with the COUNTY OF CHARLESTON, acted toward Plaintiff under color of statutes, ordinances, customs, rules, and usage of the State of South Carolina, and acted within the scope of his employment. He is sued in his individual and his official capacities.

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

Emily G. Johnston Misconduct

27) Lisa hired Emily G. Johnson who sent me an email 10/27/21 stating that she was pursuing legal action against me. I replied to Emily G. Johnston via email on 10/28/21 informing her of my fee schedule for depriving me of my God-given inalienable rights protected by the United States Constitution and the South Carolina Constitution well before she initiated action in Family Court. At the time, the fees for depriving me of my rights were approximately \$8,000,000. By her continued misconduct of sending me notices repeatedly to pay more money, she pulled more people into depriving me of my rights and they continued to deprive me of my rights which accounts for the current damages.

The COUNTY OF CHARLESTON Misconduct

28) Municipal Corporation that made it possible to deprive me of my rights by bringing all the actors together to extort money from me and to give them a venue to do so.

Alice A. Richter Misconduct

29) Alice A. Richter signed a temporary order on December 17, 2021, to steal my earnings and requiring payments that total 98% of my earnings without due process and trial by jury. It is an impossible order to allow me to live on 2% of my earnings.

Julie J. Armstrong Misconduct

30) Julie J. Armstrong by her silence and non-action, allowed persons of the B.A.R., Department of Social Services, and the commercial/quasi-judicial Family court to deprive me of my God-given rights protected by the United States Constitution

Victoria K. Rhea Misconduct

- 31) Victoria K. Rhea sent me several notices to extract money from me without due process or trial by jury
- 32) Victoria K. Rhea sent me a summons that deprived me of my religious freedom by taking a private, personal letter discussing my spiritual journey with Lisa A. France, thus prohibiting the free exercise of my religious beliefs and using it against me, South Carolina Constitution Article 1 Section 2, "...shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof"
- 33) Victoria sent me notices to submit myself to this court and enter mediation, to which I did not consent.
- 34) Victoria K. Rhea, Emily G. Johnston, or anyone else with personal knowledge did not rebut any of my affidavits on the record in case 21-DR-10-3274, therefore they stand as fact in law

Sara Von Schweinitz Misconduct

- 35) Sara Von Schweinitz mailed and emailed me several notices on the behalf of Emily G. Johnston to extort more money from me

Lisa A. France Misconduct

- 36) Lisa A. France, plaintiff and my accuser in case 21-DR10-3274, hired a team of people who conspired to deprive me of my rights and extort money from me.

Michael H. Leach Misconduct

- 37) Michael H. Leach, working with COUNTY OF CHARLESTON and other defendants, proceeded to garnish my earnings without due process and trial by jury.

Thomas T. Hodges Misconduct

38) Thomas T. Hodges signed an order on December 2, 2022, to deny my motion to dismiss the Family Court action to stop deprivation of rights; Thomas set trial by jury for April 2023, thus continuing the emotional abuse, my time to fight false allegations, stealing my earnings and requiring payments that total 75% of my earnings without due process and trial by jury

Plaintiff's Damages and Injuries

39) Plaintiff's injuries and damages include, but are not limited to:

- a. The Defendant, Lisa A. France, created a cause of action in Family Court from South Carolina Code of Laws (Statutes) that deprived me of my rights protected by the Constitutions
- b. Lisa A. France turned my children (Kate, Lindsay, and Mark) against me where none of them will speak to me now, no doubt due to false allegations filed; I had tremendous separation anxiety from Kate, Lindsay, and Mark.
- c. Lisa A. France also turned many of my siblings and their wives against me where they won't speak or associate with me now, no doubt through spread of false allegations. I had separation anxiety from my siblings.
- d. Lisa A. France won't even let me visit with my mini-Labradoodle, Charlie. He was my buddy and did everything with me. I had tremendous separation anxiety from Charlie
- e. Delay and denial of my motions to dismiss case from Family Court
- f. Garnishing my wages for over one year (and counting) where Defendants took 60% of earning (\$2678.90 every two weeks), plus required payment of medical premiums (\$3 55 every 2 weeks), plus car insurance (\$120 per month), plus attorney fees (\$5000 and counting) which totals 75% of Plaintiff's earnings (Lisa is getting \$6694 per month and my net earnings are \$881)
- g. The Court order was for even more money, but my place of work,

Advance2000, said the order violated New York State law and only took out 60% of my base earnings. The original order would have taken 98% of my wages. (\$7000 per month, plus medical, plus car insurance, plus lawyer fees)

- h. Lisa and her attorney Emily Johnston Law Firmed lied about my earnings. They used pre-covid earnings numbers and my earnings are half of what they used to be, which is why I had to file for Ch 7 bankruptcy. This caused me tremendous financial and emotional stress.
- i. I was given an order that is impossible to comply with
- j. On or about October 27, 2021 I sent this fee schedule to Emily Johnston as a notice that what she was about to do had consequences. She ignored it and I have sustained, and I am continuing to sustain these damages (they are racking up):
 - i. \$97,500 - Color of Law
 - ii. \$97,500 – Copyright name violation
 - iii. \$3 ,900,000 – Fraud Upon the Court
 - iv. \$1,950,000 – Simulating Legal Process
 - v. \$73,125 – Demand to appear in court under duress
 - vi. \$975,000 – Use of Trade Name under duress
 - vii. \$195,000 – Failure to provide contract signed by parties
 - viii. \$585,000 – Attempted coercion of funds from United States owned/controlled PERSON/Birth Certificate trust
 - ix. \$292,500 – Time to research and prepare law documents
 - x. \$8 ,165,625 - TOTAL
- k. This amount is PER DEFENDANT at this point in time.
- l. Past, present, and future financial, mental and emotional injuries and suffering;

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Malicious Prosecution Under State Law; All Defendants)

- 40) Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in ¶ 1through 39 of this complaint
- 41) By virtue of the foregoing, the Individual Defendants, acting in concert with each other

and with additional persons for whose acts they are liable, initiated, continued, and/or caused the initiation or continuation of civil damages against Plaintiff

42) Defendants used the following color of law, South Carolina Code of Law (Statutes) to deprive me of my rights and steal my property:

- a. 20-3-10(1) – Adultery
- b. 20-3-30 – Residence requirement
- c. 20-3-50 – Jurisdiction of actions for divorce
- d. 20-3-120 – Alimony and suit money
- e. 20-3-125 – Petition to enforce award of attorney fee
- f. 20-3-130 – Award of Alimony and other allowances
- g. 20-3-170 – Modification, confirmation, or termination of alimony
- h. 20-1-210 – License Required for Marriage

43) The Defendants acted with actual malice.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress Under State Law; All Defendants)

44) Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in ¶ 1 through 43 of this complaint

45) Defendants engaged in a continuous pattern of extreme and outrageous conduct directed at Plaintiff

46) Defendants engaged in that pattern of conduct with an intention to cause, or in reckless disregard of the substantial probability that it would cause, Plaintiff severe emotional distress

47) Plaintiff suffered severe emotional distress as a result of, and that was proximately caused by, the Defendants' aforementioned actions

- a. Severe emotional distress identified in ¶ 39

48) By virtue of the foregoing, Plaintiff suffered the actual damages identified in ¶ 39

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION (Abuse of Process Under State Law; Defendants ARMSTRONG, RICHTER, HODGES, JOHNSTON, RHEA, VON SCHWEINITZ, LEACH, COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

- 49) Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in ¶ 1 through 48 of this complaint
- 50) Administrators (quasi-Judges) and Attorneys swore an oath to uphold United States and South Carolina Constitutions, they totally ignored that oath in the municipal family court.
- 51) Here is the color of law scam these municipal courts are running in a nutshell. There's one system of law for the people with well-established rights of due process of law and the right to trial by jury, in all matters, secured in the State and Federal Constitutions. These rights apply in ALL civil and criminal matters regardless of how big or small the matter may be. We can agree that these rights are inalienable, indefeasible, and INVIOLENTE?
- 52) These matters should always be heard in a Judicial Court of law with a judge, a jury, and the 2 parties. These courts reside in the judicial branch of government and adhere to the three branches of government and separation of powers.
- 53) Corporations are creatures of the State, created UNDER the State constitution and created and governed through legislative statutes which assign those corporations rights specifically in certain statutes that pertain to those Corporations.
- 54) To deal with issues pertaining to corporations, which includes Municipalities and other government agencies, the Congress lawfully created Article 1 courts known as Quasi-Judicial Administrative Law Courts that run STRICTLY by the statutes that govern them. This is not my opinion this comes straight out of American Jurisprudence. These courts reside in the Executive branch of government and do not adhere to the separation of powers, as this Executive branch court acts Legislatively, Executively, and Judicially.

- 55) Along with these quasi-Judicial courts to deal with these legal corporate entities, the State Congresses created, through statute, the Summary Offense process, which covers every traffic citation, every Municipal fine, every agency fine, etc... The Summary Offense process is purposely and illegally being used against the people for financial gain.
- 56) The Summary Offense process and these Quasi-Judicial courts are completely antithetical to the Constitution that secures the people's rights, especially the rights of due process of law and the right to trial by jury.
- 57) The BAR Association and their Attorneys and the Judges, are the people orchestrating and perpetrating this fraud of forcing the people into these Quasi-Judicial courts that are steamrolling over the People's secured constitutional rights and it's happening tens of thousands of times every day! I know it's not the public servants themselves because I've spoken to enough of them to know that they're trained to not answer any questions whatsoever pertaining to the laws they are supposed to be enforcing. Try asking any public servant a question involving the law which they enforce and they can't explain what they're doing or why they're doing it, and they immediately LAWYER UP on you.
- 58) This is not my theory of what is happening, it comes straight out of American Jurisprudence. We wouldn't be having these problems if our public officials were following the constitution!

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Actual and Constructive Fraud Under State Law; Defendants ARMSTRONG, RICHTER, HODGES, JOHNSTON, RHEA, VON SCHWEINITZ, LEACH, COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

- 59) Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in ¶ 1 through 58 of this complaint
- 60) Defendants made representations of material "fact" which were false, and known to be false by Defendants, for the purpose of inducing other parties, including Plaintiff, to rely upon such false representations, and the other parties did so rely, in ignorance of

the falsity of such representations, thereby causing the Plaintiff's injuries alleged in ¶

39. Partial list of false statements in original complaint:

- a. Plaintiff is citizen and resident of Charleston County and State of South Carolina (corporations)
- b. I am the treasurer of South Carolina Assembly.
- c. I began an illicit and adulterous affair in April 2021
- d. I am subject to two bankruptcy cases
- e. Lisa believes she is entitled to divorce on grounds of adultery
- f. I am misusing assets and have wasted thousands of dollars giving to the Assembly
- g. Lisa was not informed where \$8 4,000 went
- h. That I am a "paramour" or have a "paramour"
- i. That I have substantial income (Court stole my earnings based on double what they actually are)
- j. That I owe taxes and have failed to pay them
- k. That I have an equity share in my employer, Advance2000
- l. I hold gold and silver coins because I refuse to keep money in banking institutions
- m. That there are missing assets
- n. That I am a flight risk

61) Defendants never were sworn in and never filed affidavits under full liability of perjury to make these statements; Court just believed them without question

62) Defendants rushed through a "temporary order" to permanently steal my earnings. This order is currently in place, garnishing my earnings; this was done all while I had challenged jurisdiction; when jurisdiction is challenged, everything must stop.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION (42 U.S.C. § 1983; Denial of Due Process and A Fair Trial Under the Fifth, Sixth, Seventh Amendments; All Defendants)

63) Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in ¶ 1 through 62 of this complaint

64) Any claim that any written instrument or municipal corporation grants me rights and

privileges,

- a. constitutes deprivation of my life, liberty, and property, without due process of law, protected under the 5th Amendment;
 - b. My life (health/time) was seized without due process
 - c. My liberty was threatened (contempt/jail)
 - d. My property was seized without due process (garnishing)
 - e. deprives me of my right to confront my accuser and a trial by Jury in any criminal matter, protected under the 6th Amendment;
 - f. I was denied a trial by jury in an Article 3 judicial court authorized to hear the people/confront accuser/obtain witnesses and being forced into a trial by jury Article 1 Administrative Court against my consent; At no time do I consent to this quasi-judicial process but I have to respond to their misconduct because I know that silence is acquiescence; This process has taken well over a year and deprives me of speedy trial
 - g. I am entitled to a trial by jury according to common law and I was deprived of this
 - h. deprives me of my right to live by the Common Law, to face my accuser, and a trial by jury in any civil matter, protected under the 7th Amendment;
- 65) I am a man, not a corporation and do not consent be being dragged into an Article 1 administrative court. I am not a subject or citizen, owing duties and obligations to the persons operating as the municipal corporation doing business as the "State of South Carolina" -Dun & Bradstreet Number 067006072, "County of Charleston" – Dun & Bradstreet Number 073728248, or to any other municipal corporation; nor does my physical location on the geographic region referenced as South Carolina, make me a subject or citizen, owing duties and obligations, to the municipal corporation known as the State of South Carolina, or to any other municipal corporation

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION (42 U.S.C. § 1983; Denial of Religious Freedom and Right to Assemble under the First Amendment; All Defendants)

- 66) Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in ¶ 1 through 65 of

this complaint

- 67) Any claim that any written instrument or municipal corporation grants me rights and privileges deprives me of my religious freedom and right to assemble protected under the 1st Amendment.
- 68) I am not a Christian, yet Christian bible laws are being used against me (e.g. false allegation of “adultery”)
- 69) In the Christian bible, Jesus was asked: ³⁶“Teacher, which *is* the great commandment in the law?”³⁷ Jesus said to him, ““You shall love the LORD your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your mind.’ ³⁸ This is *the* first and great commandment. ³⁹ And *the* second *is* like it: ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself.’ ⁴⁰ On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets.” Matthew 22:36-40. This lower court claims to carry more authority than Jesus? And to exact a greater penalty than the bible? I still love Lisa as my neighbor.
- 70) I am on a spiritual journey back to source and my soul contract is complete with Lisa. That’s why there is such a high regard for contracts—it is a universal/spiritual law. I have no malice towards Lisa; I just chose to follow my spiritual path which is different than hers. I still love Lisa like a neighbor (Jesus words)—I just cannot live with her to fulfil my remaining life’s mission.
- 71) **Definition of Twin Flames:** Twin flames is an earthly term used to describe a One Soul being or Graduate, one soul in 2 bodies. A one soul or graduate being is a volunteer that has been chosen to return to earthly density. As they have developed unique skills and abilities that pertain to the assistance of evolving humanity in this time frame. A graduate is a soul that has completed all earthly lessons, developed all desired skills, and finished all earthly ties (belief systems, patterns, obligations and debts).
- 72) In the original complaint, they used the private letter of my spiritual journey sent to my family against me to deprive me of my rights. I was born a Roman Catholic and moved through all kinds of spiritual practices and disciplines (e.g. Protestant, Hebrew Israelite, Gnostic, Taoism, etc.). This was much to Lisa’s dismay—she said she couldn’t keep up with my beliefs and that is true—we are on different paths; Yes, the Universe directed me and I did meet my twin flame ; I realized it as soon as we met face-to-face; A twin flame is the other half of MY soul whose genesis is my Creator/Source (this is the true

meaning of the Adam-Eve story where Eve is created from Adam's rib—it's not a general story, it is how each and every soul is split). There is a masculine and feminine aspect to our one original soul and it is a very rare occurrence to incarnate at the same time with your twin and to meet them; We did not meet for some romantic, illicit, or adulterous reason—we met to achieve our humanitarian mission that we signed up for during our preincarnate planning/contract; This information is totally left out of the Christian bible; I had a "past life regression" to learn the truth of my spiritual journey and I did discover the mission I am on; Having met the Divine Mother (Gaia) at the top of a large, white, marble, four-sided pyramid of steps, she did confirm it was time to move on with my twin flame, but to care for Lisa (which I agreed to in my private, verbal contract with Lisa, the woman see EXHIBIT FOUR); I did NOT consent to having my rights deprived by an quasi-judicial court; Yes, my vibration is rising as I feel the Fifth Density (5D) energies which was used against me in the original complaint.

- 73) The Roman Catholic Church would call my religious beliefs "New Age" or "Pagan", but "New Age" beliefs have been around long before the Roman Catholic Church and "Pagan" means nothing more than "of nature" or "of the land". The RCC has a vested interest in keeping this a secret and people enslaved.
- 74) All my spiritual, religious beliefs that I shared with Lisa were used against me to deprive me of my rights to extort money.
- 75) The original complaint also lists my association with the South Carolina Assembly as an alleged cause of action and that deprives me of my right to assemble protected by first amendment.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION (42 U.S.C. § 1983; Denial of Privacy and Seizure of my rights which are my property protected under the Fourth Amendment; All Defendants)

- 76) Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in ¶ 1 through 75 of this complaint
- 77) Defendants unlawfully seized and are continuing to seize my God-given rights

- 78) Defendants unlawfully seized and are continuing to seize my earnings
- 79) Defendants unlawfully seized and are continuing to seize my time
- 80) Defendants unlawfully seized and are continuing to seize my mental energy
- 81) Defendants unlawfully seized and are continuing to seize my health
- 82) Defendants unlawfully seized and are continuing to seize my good name
- 83) Emily Johnson's email on or around October 27, 2021 also demanded that all my electronic devices (phone, ipad, laptop) be turned over to her; she wanted to seize my technology without a proper warrant or probably cause; I did not consent to this request
- 84) I am, a living, breathing, sentient being on the land, a Natural creation of God and therefore am not and cannot be any ARTIFICIAL PERSON and, therefore, am exempt from any and all identifications, treatments, and requirements, as such pursuant to any process, law, code, or statute, or any color thereof; The lower court presumed I am a fiction, a "person" to extort.
- 85) I am whole; I am all present and accounted for from my fertilization to my last breath; My name, Christopher J. France, is used for convenience and consistency
- 86) I am the sole responsible party, owner, and holder in due course for the Property known as 115 Tomshire Drive #101, Johns Island, South Carolina, 29455, all my earnings, my biology, and financial assets and accounts; I have rights because I have complete ownership of my biology given to me by my Creator. Only owners have rights; I have rights because I am an owner of my biology.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION (42 U.S.C. § 1983; Denial of Right to Freely Travel under the Ninth Amendment; All Defendants)

- 87) Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in ¶ 1 through 86 of this complaint
- 88) Original complaint asked that I turn in my passport because I was a flight risk.
- 89) I was threatened with contempt (jail) at my first hearing when I tried to defend my rights—a violation of the 4th and 9th amendments, unlawful seizure and right to freely travel. They gave their color of law rules priority over my right to make the record and face my accuser

- 90) The temporary order signed by Alice also included a restraining order against me and that deprives me of my right to travel; I could not go near Lisa or my house; I never, ever laid a hand on Lisa in all our years together and defendants made it seem like I did; I guess their definition of harassment was me showing up at the house to mow the lawn, tend the landscaping, clean the pool, picking up Charlie's poop, and take the heavy garbage cans to the curb to help Lisa (and see Charlie my buddy mini-labradoodle); Never did I harass her—I wanted an amicable leaving; I guess my chores at the house didn't fit the "bad man" narrative that allowed Lisa's legal team to deprive me of my rights;
- 91) Because of the unlawful garnishing of wages, I can't travel as much, and I can't see my aging parents as much as I like to because I have no money.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION (42 U.S.C. § 1983; Denial of Freedom by imposing Slavery/Indentured Servitude under the Thirteenth Amendment; All Defendants)

- 92) Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in ¶ 1 through 91 of this complaint
- 93) SLAVERY. The condition of a slave; that civil relation in which one man has absolute power over the life, fortune, and liberty of another. – Black's Law 2nd Edition.
- 94) INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE. See INVOLUNTARY—Penal Servitude. In English criminal law, a punishment which consists in keeping the offender in confinement and compelling him to labor. Black's Law 2nd Edition.
- 95) INVOLUNTARY. An involuntary act is that which is performed with constraint or with repugnance, or without the will to do it. An action is involuntary, then, which is performed under duress. Black's Law 2nd Edition.
- 96) The original temporary order was signed using falsified documents to garnish nearly 100% of my earnings; Since it violated New York Law, my place of work only withheld 60% which is New York State law—this still is garnishing 75% of my earnings; that is nothing short of slavery and/or involuntary servitude and deprives me of my rights protected by the 13th amendment; I DO NOT CONSENT TO SLAVERY OR INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE.
- 97) Defendants scheduled several "Rule to Show Cause" hearings to get me to pay more,

thus continuing to deprive me of my rights

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION (42 U.S.C. § 1983; Impairing my Ability to Contract under Article I, Section 10, Clause 1; All Defendants)

- 98) Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in ¶ 1 through 97 of this complaint
- 99) I have free will; I am free; a man gives his consent via valid, lawful contract; a valid, lawful contract is between two living people, with full disclosure of covenants and conditions, a meeting of the minds, clear performance criteria, and ratified by a wet-ink autograph by both parties; the Family court has no valid, lawful contract with me yet is acting like they do—thus depriving me of my right to contract
- 100) Thinking there was some unilateral/adhesion contract, which are highly illegal by the way, that I was not aware of—I thought it might be the marriage certificate that I autographed back in 1989
- 101) In *Vankoten v. Vankoten*, 323 Ill. 323, 154 N.E. 146 (Ill. 1926) it states, “Marriage is a civil contract to which there are three parties,—the husband, the wife, and the State”; Woah, a tri-lateral contract! I do not consent to that! The only thing I could think of that created a contract with a corporate fiction/state was a marriage certificate so I recissioned it; I removed my autograph from this contract due to extreme fraud, and there is no statute of limitations for fraud; it was not a lawful contract, no full disclosure, no terms of performance, no meeting of the minds; my recission was sent to Broome County and New York State—there was no response, silence is acquiescence, so this “marriage” contract is null and void; This is on record with the Family Court and they totally ignored it, thus depriving me of my right to contract
- 102) In September 2021 when I decided I could no longer live with Lisa, we agreed to work assets/support out between us and not waste our time and money on courts/attorneys; Lisa wrote up her demands on a sheet of paper; We went back an forth a bit, but came to an agreement; She immediately wanted me to start giving her everything (e.g. gold/silver/money/furnishing/payments for various items etc) that we listed in this contract—which I did because I trusted her; She asked me to type it up on my computer so that we can have it notarized; She was asking me to sign a contract and

this was a valid, lawful contract; I did write it up and the document is EXHIBIT FOUR; I emailed it to her to review to make sure I have typed in everything correctly; She said then that I went “lawyer” on her with the contract I wrote up (which SHE ASKED ME TO DO!) so she changed her mind—she was going to sue me in Family Court; I suspect she started talking to some of her Attorney friends and they told her “hell no, don’t sign that you can get so much more”; So Lisa and I had a verbal contract, she started getting assets, then changed her mind; She not only kept all the assets that I gave her, she’s using color law and depriving me of my rights to get even more money; That is just being greedy.

103) Hypocritically, the Family Court did NOT accept Lisa’s verbal contract with me because nothing was signed, yet when I ask them to produce the signed contract that is causing me to perform, they say they don’t need a contract by their actions; They just have the “power” to steal my assets and labor without consequence and that deprives me of my right to contract.

104) Defendants are acting on a lawfully rescinded contract thus depriving me of my unlimited right to contract, Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

105) I have free will, I am free. Whose decision was it to be in a relationship with Lisa-mine? Who decided to not be in a relationship with Lisa-me? Lisa was married and divorced before me—did her first husband own her and prevent her from leaving him-no!? When /how did I agree to a contract for slavery or indentured servitude? If Lisa owns me, why not get Family Court to write an order to force me to live with her and stay married forever—problem solved? If I am her property, why waste all this time—just get out the shackles and drag me back home? How far can the State of South Carolina go to deprive me of my free will and rights protected by the United States Constitution?

106) Where did the State of South Carolina pickup rights to interfere with my free will?; I cannot not find anywhere.

107) There is no contract compelling me to perform, no covenants, no conditions, the corporation of the County of Charleston operates like there is one and refuses to

produce a valid, lawful contract.

EMPANEL GRAND JURY

Plaintiff demands the empaneling of a Grand Jury to investigate the individual Defendants for these criminal actions:

18 U.S.C. § 241 - Conspiracy against rights;
18 U.S.C. § 242 - Deprivation of rights under color of law;
18 U.S. Code § 1341- Frauds and swindles;
18 U.S. Code § 2073 - False entries and reports of moneys or securities;
18 U.S. Code § 513 - Securities of the States and private entities;
18 U.S. Code § 514 - Fictitious obligations;
18 U.S. Code § 876(d) - Mailing threatening communications; and
18 U.S.C. § 1001 - Statements or Entries Generally.

IMMUNITY

When a state officer acts under a state law in a manner violative of the Federal Constitution, he comes into conflict with the superior authority of that Constitution, and he is in that case stripped of his official or representative character and is subjected in his person to the consequences of his individual conduct. The State has no power to impart to him any immunity from responsibility to the supreme authority of the United States". **U.S. Supreme Court, in Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 94 S. Ct.1683, 1687 (1974)**

NOTICE OF HEARSAY

This is a Constitutional Court of Record in exclusive common law under Article III, sec. 2 clause 1 of the original jurisdiction and Amendment 7, Suits at Common Law. This is the only court authorized to hear matters of the People

Plaintiff, Christopher J. France, is an Ohioan, one of the People of this United States of America, and this is my court and as such:

- 1) Only Defendants listed in this action are authorized to file testimony (written or oral) into the record
- 2) Anyone other than the Defendants filing testimony into the record is hearsay and it is considered fraud upon my court.
- 3) Each non-Defendant filing into the record will incur a fee of \$5000 per occurrence
- 4) If that non-Defendant filing is not removed from the record within two days, Plaintiff will pursue contempt charges.

DAMAGES DEMAND

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgement against the Defendants as follows:

- a. For compensatory damages of not less than \$20,000,000
- b. For punitive damages against the individual Defendants of \$60,000,000, 18 U.S. Code § 2333 - Civil remedies
- c. For reasonable fees for my time, together with costs and disbursements pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983
- d. Terminate the unlawful garnishing of earnings
- e. Dismiss case 21-DR10-3274 with extreme prejudice
- f. For pre-judgement interest as allowed by law; and
- g. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: Johns Island, South Carolina

January 12, 2023

by: Christopher J. France

Christopher J. France
Sui Juris
c/o 115 Tomshire Drive, #101
Johns Island, South Carolina [29455]
(704) 661-6564 (Phone)
chrisc@christopherfrance.com (email)

*all rights reserved
without prejudice*